REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated April 28, 2006. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

Amendments

Claim 11 has been cancelled and replaced with newly presented claim 12. New claim 12 recasts the definition of the invention to clarify the features distinguishing it from the prior art.

Claim 10 has been cancelled in the interests of expediting prosecution.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 2, 4-10

Claims 6 to 8 and 11 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,120,138 to Xiao et al in view of US 2004/0055661 to Yuen and US 6,386,871 to Rossell.

Newly presented claim 12 effectively rewrites claim 5 in an independent form. The Applicant submits that the combination of elements defined by new claim 11 is not obvious in light of the cited art. The housing acts on the deformable container via the resilient member. As the first and second portions of the housing can only move a limited distance relative to each other, so to the restorative force of the resilient member is also limited by the corresponding maximum deformation. In turn, this prevents over-pressurization of the deformable container as the printing fluid is dispensed. Given the manual nature of the dispensing process, the over-pressurization safeguard in the present invention provides effective protection from excess compression with a simple and inexpensive mechanism.

In contrast, the Xiao disclosure is a syringe-type refill device where the plunger is threaded into the cap so that the ink can be forced from the barrel by rotating the plunger. There is no disclosure of a deformable container for the printing fluid. The threaded engagement of the cap and plunger, and the sealed fit between the plunger and interior of the barrel have inherent tolerance requirements that add to materials and fabrication costs. While the refill in Yuen uses a compressible container for the ink, it also has a relative complex structure with the plunger again threaded onto the barrel.

In both cases over pressurization may occur if the plunger is wound down the barrel quickly enough. Accordingly, Xiao and Yuen do not teach a resilient member engaging the housing and the deformable container in order to prevent over-pressurization..

The Rossell arrangement is a device for filling a dead tooth. It also fails to teach a resilient member engaging the deformable container and the housing to limit the manually applied pressure. The spring 11 and the vacuum pump P combine to instantly force the sealing product from the reservoir 9 into the empty pulp cavity in a tooth. It is not an overpressure safeguard mechanism.

Accordingly, the combined disclosures of Xiao, Yuen and Rossell do not teach the combination of elements defined in new claim 12. It follows that claim 12 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,
Applicant:

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762